

## REMARKS

In this amendment, Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 4-5, 9-11, 13-17, cancelled claims 8 and 12 and added claims 18 and 19. Claims 1-7, 9-11 and 13-19 are pending in this application. All essential elements and their associated pertinent functions are preciously described based on the existing specification and drawings. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner has objected claims 8 and 16. Moreover, claims 1-3, 6-8, 11-12 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Danroc et al. (USP 5,828,162) and claims 4-5 and 17, claims 9, 13 and 16, claims 10 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Danroc, further in view of Lee et al (USP 5,750,604), further in view of Nakashima et al. (USP 6,940,220), respectively.

Since claim 8 has been cancelled and claim 16 has been amended to correct the informalities, the objections are requested to be withdrawn.

In amended claims 1 and 15, referring to Applicant's Figure 2 and Spec. page 4, lines 5-18, the cathode 26 formed on the cathode layer 2 of a field-emission display includes a first conductive layer 24 in shape of a semi-spherical lump. The protruding center of the first conductive layer 24 gradually descends towards a periphery thereof, and a second conductive layer 25 formed on top of central region of the first cathode conductive layer. Thereby, the cathode 26 having all surface points equidistant to the gate conductive layer 3 is formed.

In comparison, according to Danroc's disclosure, the microheap 12 containing carbon diamond or diamond like carbon particles, which should refer to Applicant's CNT

AMENDMENT

10/823,758

(carbon nanotube) conductive layer 25, is carried by the cathode conductor 4 which should refer to Applicant's silver conductive layer 24. However, Danroc's cathode conductor 4 is in form of a plane layer and merely the microheap 12 itself is formed in a structure similar to Applicant's cathode 26. Therefore, Danroc does not disclose all the limitations in Applicant's invention. Moreover, none of the Examiner's cited references or pertinent prior art discloses all the limitations in Applicant's amended claim 1 or 15.

As such, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections. As stated in MPEP §2131:

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the...claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

(Emphases added).

Furthermore, neither Danroc nor Lee discloses using the gray-scale mask having a gradually increasing transmission rate of the light from a center to a periphery to form the silver conductive layer 24 having a lump structure in Applicant's amended claim 16.

Finally, none of the Examiner's cited references or pertinent prior art discloses the second anode conductive layer 13 wrapping the first anode conductive layer 12 therein in Applicant's amended claims 2 and 17, and further limitations claimed in newly added claim 19.

In view of the foregoing, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Entry of the amendments and issuance of a Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested. If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account Number AMENDMENT

10/823,758

502751.

Accordingly, the application is deemed to be in condition for allowance and such a Notice is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Kao H Lu/  
Kao H. Lu, Esquire  
Registration No. 43,761  
(610) 446-5886

686 Lawson Ave  
Havertown, Pa 19083